REMARKS

In the Final Office Action[1], the Examiner rejected claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,724,403 to Santoro et al. ("*Santoro*"); rejected claims 1, 3, 4, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Santoro* in view of U.S. Patent Application Pub. No. 2002/0078447 to Mizutome et al. ("*Mizutome*"); and rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Santoro*, in view of *Mizutome*, and further in view of WO 01/39494 to Escobar et al. ("*Escobar*").

Applicant proposes to amend claims 1, 5, and 7, and claims 1-9 remain pending.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Santoro*. In order to properly establish that *Santoro* anticipates Applicant's claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 102, each and every element of each of the claims in issue must be found, either expressly described or under principles of inherency, in that single reference. Furthermore, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *See* M.P.E.P. § 2131, quoting *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1126, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claim 5 recites an electronic equipment comprising, for example:

> a script text acquisition means for storing a plurality of script texts, containing at least a media element identification of visual media information to be input into an electronic equipment from one of a plurality of interfaces, an external source information of the media element, a

[1] The Final Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Final Office Action.

> display layout of the media element on a display screen, and an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces;
>
> . . . wherein
>
> the script text acquisition means determines whether the script text in an XML text or an SMIL text, performs an error process if the script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text, and cuts and divides the script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the script text is an SMIL text.

(emphasis added).

Santoro discloses a graphical environment including a grid of tiles (col. 4, lines 34-54). As depicted in Fig. 7 of *Santoro*, grid 700 comprises a matrix of tiles 702, 704, 706, 708, and 710 that are associated with different content, and grid 700 "controls the layout and priorities of the tiles" (col. 10, lines 53-54). The data structure of the tiles includes tile address 502 "that defines the location of the file system where the tile image is stored" and target address 504 "that is the location at which the file or application program associated with the tile can be found" (col. 9, lines 62-65).

The Examiner appears to assert that the grid configuration in *Santoro* discloses the claimed "script text acquisition means" (Final Office Action at pages 7-9). Applicant continues to disagree with the Examiner's position for at least the reasons stated in the Response filed October 24, 2008.

Moreover, *Santoro* also fails to teach or suggest a "script text acquisition means" that 1) "determines whether the script text in an XML text or an SMIL text," 2) "performs an error process if the script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text," and 3) "cuts and divides the script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the script text is an SMIL text," as further recited in claim 5.

Therefore, *Santoro* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, "a script text storage unit for storing a plurality of script texts, containing at least a media element identification of visual media information to be input into an electronic equipment from one of a plurality of interfaces, an external source information of the media element, a display layout of the media element on a display screen, and an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces . . . wherein . . . the script text acquisition means determines whether the script text in an XML text or an SMIL text, performs an error process if the script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text, and cuts and divides the script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the script text is an SMIL text," as recited in claim 5.

Accordingly, *Santoro* does not anticipate claim 5, and claim 5 is allowable. Claim 6 is also allowable at least due to its depending from claim 5. Independent claim 7 and dependent claim 8, while of different scope, are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above in regard to claim 5.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The prior art cited by the Examiner, *Santoro* and *Mizutome*, does not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 3, 4, and 9. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has, therefore, not been established.

Claim 1 recites an electronic equipment comprising, for example:

> script text acquisition means for acquiring a plurality of script texts, containing at least a media element identification of the visual media information to be input from one of the interfaces, an external source information of the media element, a display layout of the media element

on the display screen, and an indication of a type of equipment connected to at least one of the plurality of interfaces;

. . .

wherein the script text acquisition means determines whether the selected script text in an XML text or an SMIL text, performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text, and cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text.

(emphasis added). *Santoro* and *Mizutome*, even if combined as suggested by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest at least the claimed "script text acquisition means."

As previously stated, *Santoro* does not teach or suggest a "script text acquisition means" that 1) "determines whether the selected script text in an XML text or an SMIL text," 2) "performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text," and 3) "cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text," as recited in claim 1.

Mizutome does not cure the deficiencies of *Santoro*.

Mizutome discloses "a data processing apparatus for displaying or outputting information regarding a video, audio, and so on" (paragraph 0012). *Mizutome* does not teach or suggest the claimed combination of elements including, for example, a "script text acquisition means" that 1) "determines whether the selected script text in an XML text or an SMIL text," 2) "performs an error process if the selected script text is not an XML text or an SMIL text," and 3) "cuts and divides the selected script text into a part defining the layout of the display and a part defining the display of the visual media information if the selected script text is an SMIL text."

Accordingly, *Santoro* and *Mizutome* fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claim 1. Claims 3, 4, and 9 are also allowable at least due to their depending from claim 1.

Regarding the rejection of claim 2, dependent from claim 1, the Examiner relies on *Escobar* for allegedly disclosing "virtual channels" (Final Office Action at page 7). Even assuming this allegation is correct, which Applicant does not concede, *Escobar* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Santoro* and *Mizutome* discussed above. Therefore, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established, and claim 2 is also allowable over *Santoro*, *Mizutome* and *Escobar* for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Applicant respectfully requests that this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 be entered by the Examiner, placing claims 1-9 in condition for allowance. This Amendment should allow for immediate action by the Examiner.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully points out that the final action by the Examiner presented some new arguments against Applicant's invention. It is respectfully submitted that the entering of the Amendment would allow the Applicant to reply to the final rejections and place the application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicant submits that the entry of the amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-9 are in condition for allowance, and Applicant requests a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 23, 2009

By: /David W. Hill/
David W. Hill
Reg. No. 28,220